



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS  
Washington, D.C. 20231  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/732,541	12/07/2000	Gregory Zoller	CSCO-68341	4178

7590

11/08/2002

WAGNER, MURABITO & HAO LLP  
Third Floor  
Two North Market Street  
San Jose, CA 95113

EXAMINER

THAI, HANH B

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

2171

DATE MAILED: 11/08/2002

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

# Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/732,541

Applicant(s)

ZOLLER ET AL.

Examiner

Hanh B Thai

Art Unit

2171

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

## Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

## Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 07 December 2000.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

## Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-27 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-27 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

## Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
- Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- 11) ☐ The proposed drawing correction filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is: a) ☐ approved b) ☐ disapproved by the Examiner.
- If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply to this Office action.
- 12) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

## Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120

- 13) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some \* c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- \* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.
- 14) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application).
- a) ☐ The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.
- 15) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121.

## Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) \_\_\_\_\_.
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). \_\_\_\_\_.
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☐ Other: \_\_\_\_\_.

Art Unit: 2171

This is in response to application filed on December 7, 2000 in which claims 1-27 are presented for examination.

## **DETAILED ACTION**

### ***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which the subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

This application currently names joint inventors. In considering patentability of the claims under 35 U.S.C. 103(a), the examiner presumes that the subject matter of the various claims was commonly owned at the time any inventions covered therein were made absent any evidence to the contrary. Applicant is advised of the obligation under 37 CFR 1.56 to point out the inventor and invention dates of each claim that was not commonly owned at the time a later invention was made in order for the examiner to consider the applicability of 35 U.S.C. 103(c) and potential 35 U.S.C. 102(e), (f) or (g) prior art under 35 U.S.C. 103(a).

Claims 1-9 and 19-24 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Sehr U. S. Patent no. 6,085,976 in view of Johnson et al. U. S. Patent no. 6,253,194.

Regarding claim 1, Sehr discloses a method of providing access to information comprising the steps of:

- a) receiving a call from an application program (column 5, lines 49-54), the call specifying a user identifier (column 6, line 1) and a requested set of information of a plurality of sets of information (column 6, lines 1-8), wherein the set of requested information comprises a plurality of fields (column 13, lines 59-63) and wherein the fields describe information distributed over a plurality of databases (column 13, lines 39-44);
- b) determining the location of the requested information corresponding to the user identifier (column 18, line 57 to column 19, line 2);
- c) using the user identifier, retrieving information corresponding to a first of the plurality of fields from a first of the plurality of databases (column 28, lines 52-57);
- d) using the user identifier, retrieving information corresponding to a second of the plurality of fields from a second of the plurality of databases (column 34, lines 1-8); and

Sehr, however, does not explicitly disclose providing the set of information to the application program. Johnson, on the other hand, discloses these limitations at column 2, lines 46-54. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify Sehr, as taught by Johnson to present the information to the users.

Regarding claim 2, the limitations of this claim have been noted in the rejection of claim 1. Applicant's is directed to the rejection of claim 1 above. In addition, Sehr/ Johnson combination discloses the method as further comprising the steps of determining the entitlement

Art Unit: 2171

status corresponding to the user identifier with respect to the set of information (see column 3, lines 59-62 and column 21, lines 3-6, Sehr).

Regarding claim 3, the limitations of this claim have been noted in the rejection of claim 1. Applicant's attention is directed to the rejection of claim 1 above. In addition, Sehr/Johnson combination disclose as further comprising the steps of storing in a cache a set of information which was requested by the application program (column 5, lines 24-30, Sehr). The combination of Sehr and Johnson do not teach, "a pre-determined time has passed since the set of information was accessed, removing the set of information from the cache". But, it would have been obvious for one of ordinary skill in the art to modify the system of Sehr and Johnson to remove the information from cache or be kick off from the web when the pre-determined time has been out because it is for the security reason and system's efficiency.

Regarding claims 4-5, the limitations of this claim have been noted in the rejection of claim 1. Applicant's attention is directed to the rejection of claim 1 above. In addition, Sehr/Johnson combination disclose as further comprising the step of updating a first of the plurality of fields in the set of the information by writing information to a first of the plurality of databases (column 14, lines 42-47, Sehr).

Regarding claim 6, the limitations of this claim have been noted in the rejection of claim 4. Applicant's attention is directed to the rejection of claim 4 above. In addition, Sehr/Johnson combination disclose as further the method wherein the update is based upon monitoring activity

Art Unit: 2171

of a user of the application program, the activity being related to the information (column 41, lines 37-41, Sehr).

Regarding claim 7, the limitations of this claim have been noted in the rejection of claim

1. Applicant's attention is directed to the rejection of claim 1 above. In addition, Sehr/Johnson combination disclose as further the method of comprising a first database with entitlement information thereon and a second database with user profile information thereon (column 41, lines 45-50, Sehr).

Regarding claim 8, the limitations of this claim have been noted in the rejection of claim

1. Applicant's attention is directed to the rejection of claim 1 above. In addition, Sehr/Johnson combination disclose the method further comprising the steps of providing a parameter to the application program and the application program passing the parameter when requesting user profile data (column 2, lines 14-20, Johnson).

Regarding claim 9, the limitations of this claim have been noted in the rejection of claim

1. Applicant's attention is directed to the rejection of claim 1 above. In addition, Sehr/Johnson combination disclose as further comprising the step of moving the information corresponding to a first of the plurality of fields from a first of the plurality of databases to a second of the plurality of databases (column 5, lines 27, Sehr).

Regarding claims 19-24, the elements of these claims have been rejected in the analysis above and these claims are rejected on that basis.

Claims 10-18 and 25-27 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Sehr U. S. Patent no. 6,085,976 in view of Sarkar U. S. Patent no. 6,418,448.

Regarding claim 10, Sehr discloses a computer readable medium having stored thereon program instructions for providing access to information stored on a plurality of databases:

- the program further operable to process requests from an application program, the requests identifying a first of the plurality of logical collections of the information and a first of a plurality of users (column 6, lines 1-10, Sehr);
- the program further operable to retrieve the information corresponding to the at least the first of the plurality of fields, the information corresponding to the user identified by the request from the application program (column 5, lines 44-49 and column 34, lines 1-8, Sehr).

Sehr, however, does not explicitly disclose the logical map and physical map the plurality of fields of the information to the plurality of databases. Sarkar, on the other hand, discloses these limitations at (column 5, lines 63-67; column 6, lines 14-19 and lines 19-22). It would have been obvious for one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify Sehr, as taught by Sarkar to fetch and manipulate information (column 6, line 50, Sarkar).

Regarding claim 11, the limitations of this claim have been noted in the rejection of claim 10. Applicant's attention is directed to the rejection of claim 10 above. In addition, Sehr/Sarkar

Art Unit: 2171

combination discloses the computer wherein the plurality of databases comprises a first database and a second database (column 5, lines 12-15, Sehr).

Regarding claim 12, the limitations of this claim have been noted in the rejection of claim 11. Applicant's attention is directed to the rejection of claim 11 above. In addition, Sehr/Sarkar combination discloses the computer wherein the first database comprises entitlement information (column 3, lines 59-62, Sehr).

Regarding claim 13, the limitations of this claim have been noted in the rejection of claim 11. Applicant's attention is directed to the rejection of claim 11 above. In addition, Sehr/Sarkar combination discloses the computer readable medium wherein the second database comprises user profile information (column 5, lines 64-67, Sehr).

Regarding claim 14, the limitations of this claim have been noted in the rejection of claim 10. Applicant's attention is directed to the rejection of claim 10 above. In addition, Sehr/Sarkar combination discloses as further operable program to store the requested set of information and to remove the requested set of information if it has not been accessed for a pre-determined period of time (column 2, lines 36-40, Sarkar).

Regarding claim 15, the limitations of this claim have been noted in the rejection of claim 10. Applicant's attention is directed to the rejection of claim 10 above. In addition, Sehr/Sarkar combination discloses as further operable program to update the information for the first of the



logical collections of the information by writing to a first of the plurality of databases (column 14, lines 1-3, Sehr).

Regarding claim 16, the limitations of this claim have been noted in the rejection of claim 10. Applicant's attention is directed to the rejection of claim 10 above. In addition, Sehr/Sarkar combination discloses the computer wherein the physical mapping further maps the plurality of fields of the information to a database which is external to a system in which the computer readable medium resides (column 6, lines 19-22, Sarkar).

Regarding claim 17, the limitations of this claim have been noted in the rejection of claim 10. Applicant's attention is directed to the rejection of claim 10 above. In addition, Sehr/Sarkar combination discloses the computer wherein the information relates to a single user (column 5, lines 64-67, Sehr).

Regarding claim 18, the limitations of this claim have been noted in the rejection of claim 10. Applicant's attention is directed to the rejection of claim 10 above. In addition, Sehr/Sarkar combination discloses the computer wherein the information comprises information pertaining to a group of users (column 5, line 67 to column 6, lines 1, Sehr).

Regarding claims 25-27, the elements of these claims have been rejected in the analysis above and these claims are rejected on that basis.

Art Unit: 2171

*Conclusion*

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Hanh B Thai whose telephone number is 703-305-4883. The examiner can normally be reached on 8 AM - 4:30 PM.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Safet Metjahic can be reached on 703-308-1436. The fax phone numbers for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned are 703-746-9099 for regular communications and 703-746-7240 for After Final communications.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is 703-305-3900.

Hanh Thai HT  
Art Unit 2171  
November 1, 2002

  
SAFET METJAHIC  
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER  
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2100